

THE  
ARCH-REBEL found;

OR AN

# ANSWER

TO

Mr. M. H. s. Brief Enquiry into the true Nature of SCHISM.

---

By T. W. Citizen of Chester, and a Sincere lover  
of Truth.

---

EZEK. 13 Verse 10.

*Because, even because they have seduced my People, saying Peace, and there was no Peace.*

---



---

Printed for the Author, in the Year, 1690.

tel  
fir  
win  
on  
by  
ha  
aa  
D  
an  
bo  
ca  
to

ARCHIVES

121A

121A

N



# TO THE READER.

**T**H O by many Learned and Pious Clergy-men of our Church, the Folly and Schism of our Dissenters, has been clearly and sufficiently evinced and demonstrated; yet you see how restless their Spirits are, and with what little Shifts they continue to buoy up their Faction: The little Book of Mr. M. H's Enquiry, &c. shall by them be vastly prefer'd to, and Dogmatically affirm'd, to have the Conquest over all the Learned, Orthodox and Laborate Writings, of Hooker, Bramhall, Hammond, Mauderston, and divers others. I have heard some of his Disciples boast, that it was not, nor could be Answer'd by any of the Church-men; which considering, and withall, how it was as much below a Clergy-man to spend his precious time about such a trifle of a Book, as it is for a Lyon to concern himself with a little insignificant barking Whelp;

*I undertook my Lay-brother ; with a Resolution of Patience and Courage, without any Apology ; (being not skill'd therein) to undergo the censures of all that read these papers.*

*If thou be a true Member of our Church, I have confidence and am well assured, thy precious Balm will never break my Head ; thy Religion hath taught thee Charity and Candor sufficient to cover any weakness, that thou mayest discover ; and if thou art pleas'd with my attempt, it is my great satisfaction.*

*If thou be a Dissenter who has not Sacrificed thy Name to the Factions, so as to divest thy self of all Christian Temper of Humility and Consideration, there is hope of thy Reconciliation, and that thou wilt consider thy desperate State and Condition ; and if my weak endeavours may contribute to the snatching thee as a Fire-brand out of the Fire, I shall exceedingly rejoice, but not I only, for the Blessed Angels in Heaven will have joy among them, for thy Addition to the Catholick Church ; of which they are the most Glorious Members.*

*If thou be Sceptical, a Slighter of our Religion, Obstinate and Perverse, a Despisers and Reviler of our Clergy, whom I esteem as the Stewards of the Mystery of God, and the Ministers of Reconciliation ? I shall altogether glory in thy Scoffs, and have a low esteem of thy good words.*

THE



( I )



THE  
ARCH-REBEL found;  
OR AN  
ANSWER  
TO

Mr. M. H's Brief Enquiry into the true nature of  
Schism, &c.

---

S I R,

**I**AD your Enquiry been to find out the true Notion of the Ninth Article in the Apostles Creed, (viz.) *I believe the Holy Catholick Church, the Communion of Saints?* You had then found the true Standard, by which you might have made a far clearer discovery of Schism, than you have done by your Enquiry.

For which purpose I offer to your Consideration, first the Originati- on and first Existence of the Catholick Church; which was before the day of Pentecost; Acts i. v. 15. *The number of the Names together, were about an Hundred and Twenty*: This Number consisted of the Apostles and Disciples.

That this was the Church, appears, Cap 2. v. 47. *And the Lord added to the Church* (that is to the Apostles and Disciples) *divly such as should be saved*; To encrease his Church, and to plant it in all Nations, (Christ Jesus the head thereof, gave unto the Apostles Universal power, (Saint John, 20. 21. *As the Father sent me, even so send I you*) to Preach the Gospel to all the World; that in every Nation, they that believe might be Baptiz'd and made Members of this Church, which is the Mystical Body of Christ.

And the Apostles according to the Command of our Saviour, and by Virtue of that Power wherewith he invested them, and those extraordinary gifts which they received by the Descent of the Holy Ghost, enabling them mightily for so great a work, did preach the Gospel to all Nations; and so wonderfully prevail'd, that in the life time of St. John, there were Seven Churches Established in *Asia*, under Seven Bishops, each Church having a Bishop presiding over it; which is very manifest by the name Angel, which St. John gives them. Now, though there be a Multiplication or Plurality of Churches, by the encrease of Believers, yet no variation; they are all one with that Church first mentioned at *Jerusalem*, and all one with one another, being all United into one Spiritual Society, or Body, under one Head Christ Jesus, and are in all things the same with that first Church; United in one Baptism, and in one Faith; and all partake at the same Table, eating the same Bread, being the Symbol of the same Body which suffered on the Cross; and drinking all of the same Cup, the Cup of the New Testament, the Symbol of the Blood of Christ which he shed for his Church; and so United all, in the visible external Worship and Service of God. This is Original and first being of the Church.

The next thing, Sir, I offer to your consideration, is the Continuance & Duration of this Church on Earth, and that is till our Blessed Saviour's second Advent, St. Mat. 28. 20. *And lo I am with you always; even to the end of the World, Amen.*

The power wherewith our Blessed Saviour vested the Apostles, was not to cease or expire with them; but as they had received the power of Governing, and Confering Orders in the Church from Christ Jesus, so they conferr'd the same on others, that the Church might for ever retain this Apostolical power; and thus, in this respect our Lord is with his Church to the end of the World.

And

And this Apostolical Succession was begun in *Timothy* and *Titus*, the former being Ordained by the Apostles, Bishop of *Ephesus*, the other Bishop of *Creet*; that they were both invested with power of jurisdiction, and conferring Orders; and that though in each Diocesis there were many Presbyters, yet that none had Authority to ordain Elders or Priests but they, is most manifest by *Saint Paul's* Epistles to them both.

To propagate this Apostolical Succession, *Linus*, by Apostolical Consecration Succeeded the Apostles in the See of *Rome*; *Symeon* Succeeded *Saint James* in the Chair of *Jerusalem*; *Anianus* Succeeded *Saint Mark* in the Jurisdiction of the Church of *Alexandria*. And this Succession in the right line from the Apostles, to secure the Church from Impostors and Pretenders, was so sacredly carried on, and propagated with such certainty, that *Saint Irenaeus* affirms, he could name all the Successors of the Apostolick Churches unto his days.

And accordingly, this line of Apostolick Succession of Bishops, hath continued in all Ages without interruption, to this present time. Now whoever he be, that is out of this line of Apostolick Succession, and exercises any Ministerial Office, without the Commission of Episcopal Ordination, can be no more or other, than a Lay-Impostor, and a Schismatick. And consequently, all Societies of Christians, who withdraw themselves from the Government of their Bishops, who are the Apostles Successors; and from communicating with those Presbyters lawfully set over them, by Episcopal Ordination and Institution, and frame themselves into any other kind of Government, are guilty of Schism. This is the true formal Notion of Schism, in the sense of the Fathers in the primitive Church.

Of which more anon.

This Church so constituted and established to continue to the end of the World; from its Universality was by the Primitive Fathers, called the Catholick Church; and from its Unity the Communion of Saints. Which is now to be considered.

What this Union and Communion of Saints is? appears by Holy Scripture, *St. John 13. v. 35. By this shall all men know, that ye are my Disciples if ye have love one for another.* Love is the Badge of a Disciple of Christ, and Member of the Catholick Church; but there must be more in the command to the Disciples, to love one another, than commonly the acceptance

*Lib. 3.  
adv.*

*Her. c. 3.*

acceptation Love hath; for the Christian Religion enjoys Love and Charity to all men; To Love our Enemies, to pray for them that hate us, and to do good to them that despitefully use us and persecute us; is the command of our Blessed Saviour, and *Gal. 6. v. 10. As we have therefore opportunity let us do good unto all men.* So that this Love which one Disciple is to have for another, must be such as distinguisheth Christians from all other men.

Now what can that be, but to love one another as members of the same Body, whereof Christ is the Head; and what can that be, but to live in Christian Communion and Fellowship one with another?

It cannot be the bare loving one another; for there are some who are not Christians, who are so bountiful and loving towards all men; that if this were the only Characteristical mark of a Christian, they would and must pass for Christians, without believing in Christ: And who seeth not, that Pyrats and Robbers, and the vilest of men love one another? So that it is (as before is said) not the bare loving one another, by which men are known to be Christians, but the being admitted by Baptism into the Society of the Christian Church, and loving one another in the Communion of that Church; this is that which makes true Christian Charity. Saint *Paul* commands (*1 Cor. 12. 25, 26.*) that there be no Schism in the Body, but the Members should have the same care one for another, and whether one Member suffers, all the Members suffer with it; or one Member be honored, all the Members rejoice with it; now ye are the Body of Christ, and Members in particular. Christians to love one another, is to love like Members of the same Body, to preserve the Body from all Rents and Schisms, and to maintain Sympathy and Charity in the Communion of Christs Body, whereof we are all Members. So that Christian Charity unites us to Christs Body, and nothing but Christian Love and Charity, that doth not unite us in one Body, unto one Communion; that is, one external visible Communion of the Christian Church.

Thus you see, that by the words Christian Love and Charity, somewhat used in Scripture, must be understood the Communion of Saints; and that out of the Communion of Saints, there can be no Christian Charity. And so is the same thing meant; expressed by other words, namely Brotherly Love, *Rom. 10. 12.* and by the name Brethren. *Heb. 13. v. 1.*

*Let brotherly Love continue:* This term Brother was given to none but those who liv'd in Communion with the Church; not the Gnosticks, who separated from it under pretence of greater Knowledge, nor any who separated upon any pretence whatsoever.

And after the Apostles, the Primitive Church did confine the Christian Brother-hood to the Communion of the Church; all the Precepts relating to Brotherly Love, either in the Evangelists or Apostles, suppose Christians to be Members of the Mystical Body of Christ, that is his Church, and to be all United there in full Communion; and this is what the apostle means to have no Schism in the Body: out of all which it appears.

Further to assent to, and believe all the Articles of Faith, contained in the Apostles, *Nicene* and Saint *Athanasius's* Creed, allow'd and receiv'd in the Primitive Church; to partake all of the same Table, where we all partake of the same Body which was broken for us; and of the same Blood which was shed for us; and to join all in the same holy Prayers and Supplications, Intercessions, and giving of thanks; made (as the Apostles expressly commands) for all men, to be Subject and Obedient to our Spiritual Rulers and Governors (who have derived their Power and Authority from the Apostles, by a due succession to this present Age) in all things pertaining to Godly Life, Decency and Order, as the Catholics did in the Primitive times; this is true Christian Charity in the Language of the Scriptures, and this is the Communion of Saints.

To hold Communion in the Articles of Faith only, or what you call Fundamentals, without any visible Sign of being in Communion with some Church, that is a true Member of the Catholick Church, is not sufficient to make a Catholick, or one in the Communion of Saints; although without such a Communion of Faith, it is impossible to be so.

*Cavalier* and his Company were of the same Creed with *Moses* and *Aaron*, yet were Schismatical wretches, and were punished with a Vengeance. The *Don* it is whom you acknowledge to be Schismatics, held the Fundamentals of Religion, but their separate Communion from the Catholick Church, upon pretence of greater purity, & excluding all other Churches as not Catholic; this made 'em Schismatics in the judgment of the Fathers in the Catholick Church at that time. So that all particular Churches, who agree with the Primitive Catholick Church in all the Articles of



Faith; and in the external visible Worship and Service of God, are true Members of the Catholick Church, and in the Communion of Saints and no other.

The Church of England then, having from the first planting of the Gospel here, retained the Apostolick power of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, and Ordaining Priests by an uninterrupted Succession of Arch Bishops and Bishops, in the right line, from the Apostles to this present time; and agreeing with, and no way repugnant to the Primitive Catholick Church in Doctrin, Discipline and Worship, is truly a Member of the Universal Catholick Church, out of which there is no Communion of Saints.

The necessary consequence whereof, is, that they who live within the Jurisdiction of the Church of England, and refuse Communion with her, in the external visible Worship and Service of God; do exclude themselves from being Members of the Catholick Church, or in the Communion of Saints; and are, consequently guilty of Schism.

The reason is plain, because there is no other way for any to hold Communion with the Universal Catholick Church, but by holding Communion with the particular Church wherein they live, that Church not being Schismatical; all the particular Churches through all the World, being the Members that make up the Mystical Body of Christ, the one Catholick Church.

Sir, having shewed you as clearly as I can, the true Notion of the Catholick Church and Communion of Saints: Schism is so clearly unmasked, that a man may, though not from the same impulse, yet with as much certainty, pronounce and declare you a Schismatick, as the Prophet Nathan did King David's Sin, when he said, *Thou art the Man.*

For it is most manifest, that all who pretend Christianity, and wilfully refuse Communion with the Catholick Church, do cut themselves off from, and cease to be Members of the Body of Christ; for he hath but one Body, that is his Church; and this in the Language of the Scriptures, and the Judgment of the Fathers in the Primitive Times is Schism. And this agrees too, with the Nature and Signification of the Word.

Sir,

and, are  
Saints  
ing of  
ididid  
Bishops  
; and  
church  
verial  
n the  
her,  
hem-  
mmu-  
hold  
dding  
urch  
l the  
hrift,  
Ca-  
ur-  
with  
the  
the  
ful-  
s off  
but  
rrip-  
s is  
of  
Sir,

(7)  
Sir, though it be above my Education, yet since I undertook your En-  
quiry, I have made search, and do give you this following account of  
these Fathers whose Judgments are against you.

St. Irenaeus Bishop of Lugdunum, who was Cotemporary with Polien-  
tus a Disciple of St. John, (who must in Reason be allowed to know the  
primitive, Apostolick notion of Schism, better than you, or any who are  
of your Faction) exhorts all Christians to harken to those Presbyters, who  
were in the Communion of the Catholick Church, and that they might  
not be deceived, describes them.

*Qua propter is, qui in Ecclesia sunt Presbyteris obaudire oportet eis, qui eis*  
*Successionem habent ab Apostolis, &c.*

Wherefore they are oblig'd to obey those Presbyters, who are within  
the Pale of the Church, who (as we have shown) are the Successors of  
the Apostles, who have received the sure gift of Truth; together with an  
Apostolick right of Succession, according to the Degree of the Fathers

*Reliquos vero qui abisunt a principali Successione: & quocunque loco colle-*  
*guntur, &c.* As for those who renounce the Apostolical Succession, and  
Assemble themselves in any place whatsoever, suspect and esteem them as  
Heretical and Damnable Opinions, who flatter themselves with hope of  
Lucre and Vain Glory; but as for them who rend and tear in pieces the  
Unity of the Church, they shall receive punishment of God, as Jerobo-  
am did.

St. Irenaeus the Second Bishop of Antioch from St. Peter, in his *Ep. ad*  
*Trallianus, ad Smyrnenses*, and in those to the *Philippians, &c.* frequent-  
ly charges 'em to keep in the Unity of the Christian Church, by a regular  
obedience to the Bishops, and by Communicating with those Presbyters,  
who were set over them by Authority of Episcopal Order: that to disobey  
those Bishops and their Presbyters, and to separate from them, is in those  
Epistles charged with Schism.

St. Athanasius brands *Ischyas* for a Schismatick, and gives this Reason  
for it; that *Ischyas* did Usurp a Ministerial Authority, without regular  
Ordination from the Bishops of the Catholick Church, and gather'd  
to himself a Congregation, separate from the Bishop of *Alexandria*, in  
whose Province he liv'd.

St. Cyprian, *Ep. 4. ad populum Carthaginiensem, de quinque Presbyteris;*  
exhorts them to have no Communion with those who had divided them-  
selves

selves from their Bishops; assuring them, that to be *see Episcopis*, was to be *extra Ecclesiam*. And in his Book *De Unitate*, he gives this Notion of Schism; *Contemptus Episcopis, & Derelictis Dei sacerdotibus, constiture aliud Altare, aut Conventicula dixerit a consuetudine*. That it was Schism to dispute and forsake the Bishops and Priests of God, and to set up another Altar; or to set up distinct Conventicles.

Sir, though I pretend not to the Originals, yet having found these Instances produced by men of unquestionable Sincerity, and great Learning; I presume to present you with them. I have more of this kind before me, but these Testimonies are sufficient, to shew how different from, and far short your description of Schism is, from the Notion of Schism the Fathers had in the Primitive times; and that in their Judgment you are Guilty of Schism.

Sir, you cannot by this time but see your Guilt; and though you, as Criminals usually before our Tribunals, plead not Guilty, (tis your own phrase) yet I beseech you consider, your Trial must be before that Tribunal which cannot be deceived or biased; you had better try and judge your self now, than you be not judged. To live in Schism you ingeniously acknowledge, is a black and banious Crime (to promise and patronize it as you do, must then be a great aggravation of it) it is to be out of the Catholick Church and Communion of Saints, out of which there is no ordinary means, nor any firm ground to fix any hope of Salvation; its plain *Acts 2. 47. The Lord daily added to the Church such as should be saved*; no being added to the Church, no being saved: there is no other way revealed by which you may be saved. And it concerns you highly, to consider how you can answer for all those many poor Souls, that you seduce into Schism, and so industriously keep out of Christs Fold. I caution you in all Meekness, and Christian Charity; and out of a sincere desire of your eternal welfare; and if you have that preparedness of mind, that Meekness and Self-denial, which the Holy Jesus requires, in the Gospel, you will no longer contend with Flesh and Blood, but immediately surrender your self into the Communion of that Church, where if you will not be wanting to your self, you will find all the satisfaction that a Christian can desire; these being all things exhibited to you that appertain to Life and Salvation.

And thus I have said all that I thought fit to say on this subject, and I am, Sir, your humble servant.

Having

Having thus finished what I designed, as sufficient to shew you the true Notion of Schism, and your mistake in the Nature of it; I proceed to make some Remarks upon your Brief Enquiry, &c.

THE Scope of all you say, till your Instance of Eldad and Medad, amounts to no more, but that Schism is an Arch-Rêvel, &c. a deformed Brat, &c. a Crime so black, no body will plead Guilty to the Indissemment. And then comes another Law term, Hue and Cry, &c. 'tis an heinous Crime, but 'tis very difficult and scarce possible to find it, it cannot be described.

All I need say to this, is, the difficulty is removed; I have plainly shew'd you how to describe it, and so to make a true Judgment, who are Guilty, whether they plead Guilty, or not Guilty.

The Instance of Eldad and Medad, is nothing to the purpose of Schism, for, they were not (if I mistake not) to administer in Holy things; not anything of the Priest-hood, but that Spirit of Prophecy which they received, was to qualify them for the case of Moses in the Civil Government; and a Crime in the State is Sedition, not Schism. Yet they did not assume that without Divine Authority: and when you can make as signal a proof that your Authority is Divine, we will no more blame you for Exercising in your Stable, then Moses did them, for Prophecying in the Camp.

In Page 8. you say, I cannot believe that the greatest Worshipers of the Diana of their own Opinions, will be so scrupulous as to brand those for Schismatics, who in every punctilio of Opinion are not exactly of the same Stand, with themselves.

When you mean by the greatest Worshipers of the Diana of their own Opinions, I take not upon me to tell *p* but if by that saucy Language, you mean the Bishops and the other inferior Clergy of the English Church: I can answer for them, that if the punctilios of Opinions you mean, do not cause a Separate Communion: they will never censure that for Schism.

It is not Opinions differing in little things (as you call 'em) but the erroneous and sinful Opinions, that tend to Separation from a truly Catholic Church, that they of our Church (to use your words) brand with Schism; men may differ in Opinion in speculative things, and

and be Innocent, but Opinions that break the Communion of Saints, are Schism.

Pardon me if I give you a pleasant Instance; your Father's Opinion was, that it was best to put you to be a Lawvers, or an Attorney's Clerk (as I have heard) my Uncle who was (*in loco parentis*) my Guardian, his Opinion was, that it was best to put me an Apprentice to a Mercer; here were different Opinions or Apprehensions, but no Schism.

In your Ninth Page, you put a fair Question, enough to make the World believe you to be a man of great sincerity, viz. *Whether a dissimilarity or separation of opinions, be the formalis ratio of Schism.* I affirm and have prov'd it is: but you answer it with great partiality, making

a most unnatural Exposition of the Apostles words that can be; I Cor. I

10. *I beseech you Brethren, that there be no divisions among you.* (which you rightly say, is in the Margin Schisms) and pretend upon Enquiry to find what the Schism is, by the next following Exhortation of the Apostle; *That ye all speak the same thing*s, (which you expound) viz. *In the Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity, for in little things ye can never be made duty to be of the same Opinion, since it is naturally impossible.* And you name *Ephesus*, but do not make him vouch for your Exposition; if his Exposition agrees with yours (which I rather think it does not) it cannot be the Apostles meaning: for you say, *Observe, he does not oblige us to think the same things, i. e. In your preaching and converse, speak of these things only wherein you are agreed; and for those things wherein you differ, do not fall out and fight about them, but love one another notwithstanding.*

To this I Answer.

St. Paul is mightily oblig'd to you for this Exposition; you say, he doth not oblige us to think the same things: but though your thoughts be diverse, yet speak the same things; what is this? but that men may think one thing and speak another; (this does not agree with the sincerity of Saint Paul) for this is down right Hypocritism and Knavery; I can make nothing else of it.

But you think to make it Orthodox by an i. e. *In your preaching and converse, speak those things only wherein you are agreed, &c.*

This Doctrine were it known, would reconcile the World, this would merit a Dispensation at Rome, you may be admitted there upon these terms; if in your Preaching and Converse you will speak of nothing but wherein



wherein you are all agreed. The Pope, they say, is commonly an old civil Gentleman, and this new Doctrine of yours, tending so much to Peace, and to the stopping of the mouths of Hereticks, who are apt to speak of things wherein they are not all agreed; would move him to think of some preferment for you. But if they at Rome should prove so inhumanly morose and sullen, as to make your Journey thither unfortunate, this Doctrine cannot fail of entertainment at *Constantinople*; the Merchants who trade thither, will assure you, that the Mahometans are very obliging to all those, who preach and say nothing in converse, but wherein all are agreed; and you being withal a great abhorrer of Popish delusions, they will *nomine contradicente*, heartily agree with you therein; and you being a Minister too, as you say in your *Enquiry*, page 27. *And as such obliged to preach, and to trade with that Talent you have received* (or you say) *there will be an uncomfortable account shortly; especially* (say you) *if we look abroad, and consider how the apparent necessities of precious Souls, calls for our utmost diligence.*

Sir, there are abroad at *Constantinople* abundance of precious Souls, who want your diligence: Now you, who say nothing in your preaching and converse, but wherein all are agreed, will oblige 'em to hear you, and so you will gain an opportunity to preach your great Gospel Truths to 'em, among whom there's nothing so much wanting; one Voyage of you, and all your Brethren with your Talents thither, could not fail of great improvement; that place totally wanting you, and we having not here so great occasion, or necessity for you here; it would look like a real sense of your Duty, if you would embark thither, to take care of the many precious Souls there, who are like to miscarry for want of you: And pray consider, our Church-men are so invincibly lazy, they'l never undertake it; and if some of them should have the Courage? alas, they are so dull, it would be to no purpose: You are much more qualify'd for it, who by Inspiration hold forth with such life and vigour, so much more powerful, that the success could not fail in you; and beside all this, there is no reason to fear, that one Soul here would perish by your absence. This Doctrine of yours, justly deserves this Harangue.

But does not this Exposition of yours, barr all reasoning and lessen the use and power of preaching, one main end and design whercof, is to convince men of error, and so to unite their minds and affections, by Unit-

ing

ing their Judgments and Understanding; you say not one word of Union and Communion, which is most strictly enjoyed in every Sentence in the Exhortation; That there be no Divisions or Schisms, which by the other Sentences, the Apostle tells 'em how to prevent, (*viz.*) that you all speak the same things, that ye be perfectly joyn'd together in the same mind, and in the same judgment; now it's impossible for people that speak the same things, and are perfectly joyn'd together in the same mind, and in the same judgment, to have any Divisions or Schisms. That learned and pious Doctor in our Church, Doctor Hammond, Familiar in Fathers and Councils, hath this Paraphrase upon this Text: *That, therefore which I first exhort you to, and that with all earnestness as possible (as the prime addition of these gifts, and graces that are among you) is this, that ye all teach the same Doctrine, and nourish Charity and Unity; that there be no divisions in the Churches, but that ye be compacted, and United as Members of the same Body, in the same belief and affection.* Is not this quite different from your Exposition? you take off the force and efficacy of the Apostle's Exhortation to Unity, purposely to excuse your Schism; is any thing more demonstrative in the World, than that your practice is quite contrary to this Exhortation; who have set up a Communion separate from the Church of God, establish'd in this Kingdom, both by Divine and Civil Sanction.

You are unlucky in your Exposition, very wide from the mark; and it can never fare otherwise with you, while you live in Schism; it being the Nature of Schism to hurry men into a thousand errors.

Again in the former Paragraph, *That ye all speak the same things, viz. In the Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity, for (say you) so little things it can never be made a duty to be of the same Opinion, since it is morally impossible.* I must here say again what I have said; that different Opinions in meer Nations and Speculations, or any differing Opinions that break in our Communion, are not here meant; for so men may differ and not be guilty of Schism: But if you mean by morally impossible, that it is impossible for Christians to be perfectly joyned together in the same mind, and in the same judgment (as the Apostles exhort) so, as to maintain Unity, and prevent Schism in the Church; either the Apostles Exhortation is to no purpose and effect, or your insinuation very vain. You go on, that ye be perfectly joyned together with the same mind, and in the same judgment

judgment (which say you) must be understood of a serious endeavour as for it, for otherwise a perfect conjunction must be reserved for a world of other everlasting perfection.

Sir, are you so self dignify'd (to use your own words) as to be a Teacher of Saints, and know not, that a perfect Conjunction in the Catholick Church, and Communion of Saints, is required of all those who are to be one to the world of everlasting perfection?

Your 11, 12, and 13, pages, are filled with an Enquiry of the *Corinthians* misinterpretage; you say, that *Clemens Romanus*, in his famous Epistle to the *Corinthians*, *he* calls *Schisms* contentions, which I believe is true. For *Schism* is the Mother of Contention.

You find that the *Corinthians* were divided in their Opinions, about their Ministers, one cries *I am of Paul*, as more Edifying; another cries *I am of Apollos*, and another *I am of Cephas*; this you say, did not make the *Schism*; for say you, *Why might not each go where he might be most edified*? but you say the *Schism* was, in that they Sacrifice to *Christian Love* and *Charity*; and after you say a great deal to little purpose. For,

Its very plain, the *Corinthians* were accused of that you call *Schism*, are y for preferring, or admitting one Minister above another, though justification was the pretence, and not for breach of Communion, for with themsoever they Communicated, it was one and the same Communion; or Saint *Paul* and Christ were not divided, nor were either of the other divided from Christ, their Communion was the same, though their Cures were several; so that there was no reason (as you impertinently say) to silence any of them, for in them there was no *Schism*, nor any blame. But say you, *the way of curing this Schism was not to silence Apollos and Cephas, that they might all be of Paul*, and here you make St. *Paul* some sort of amendments for your former Scandalous Exposition, in saying, *that he preferred Souls Satisfaction before his own Credit*.

How impertinently do you say, the way to Cure this *Schism* was not to silence Apollos, &c. As if to silence you, that your followers may come to Church, were as illegal as to have silenced them: Sir there is a vast difference between you, and they, who are Pastors and Ministers of Christ, they are the Stewards of the Mysteries of God, and the Ministers of Reconciliation, and are made so by Apostolical Power; of them our Blessed Saviour saith (St. *John* 10. v. 2.) thus, *He that enreth in by the door, is the Shepherd.*

ing their Judgments and Understanding; you say not one word of Union and Communion, which is most strictly enjoyned in every Sentence in the Exhortation; That there be no Divisions or Schisms, which by the other Sentences, the Apostle tells 'em how to prevent, (*viz.*) that you all speak the same things, that ye be perfectly joynd together in the same mind, and in the same judgment; now it's impossible for people that speak the same things, and are perfectly joynd together in the same mind, and in the same judgment, to have any Divisions or Schisms. That learned and pious Doctor in our Church, Doctor Hammond, Familiar in Fathers and Councils, hath this Paraphrase upon this Text: *That, therefore, which I first exhort you to, and that with all earnestness as possible (as the prime addition of these gifts, and graces that are among you) is this, that ye all teach the same Doctrine, and nourish Charity and Unity; that there be no divisions in the Churches, but that ye be compaſſed, and United as Members of the same Body, in the same belief and affection.* Is not this quite different from your Exposition? you take off the force and efficacy of the Apostle's Exhortation to Unity, purposely to excuse your Schism; is any thing more demonstrative in the World, than that your practice is quite contrary to this Exhortation; who have set up a Communion separate from the Church of God, established in this Kingdom, both by Divine and Civil Sanction.

You are unlucky in your Exposition, very wide from the mark; and it can never fare otherwise with you, while you live in Schism; it being the Nature of Schism to hurry men into a thousand errors.

Again in the former Paragraph, *That ye all speak the same things, viz. In the Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity, for (say you) in little things it can never be made a way to be of the same Opinion, since it is morally impossible.* I must here say again what I have said; that different Opinions in meer Notions and Speculations, or any differing Opinions that break not Communion, are not here meant; for so men may differ and not be guilty of Schism: But if you mean by morally impossible, that it is impossible for Christians to be perfectly joynd together in the same mind, and in the same judgment (as the Apostles exhort) so, as to maintain Unity, and prevent Schism in the Church; either the Apostles Exhortation is to no purpose and effect, or your insinuation very vain. You go on, that ye be perfectly joynd together with the same mind, and in the same judgment

judgment (which say you) must be understood of a serious endeavour after it, for otherwise a perfect conjunction must be reserved for a world of everlasting perfection.

Sir, are you so self dignify'd (to use your own words) as to be a Teacher of Saints, and know not, that a perfect Conjunction in the Catholick Church, and Communion of Saints, is requir'd of all those who are to come to the world of everlasting perfection?

Your 11, 12, and 13, pages, are filled with an Enquiry of the *Corinthians* misgarage; you say, that *Clemens Romanus*, in his famous Epistle to the *Corinthians*, *still calls Schisms contentions*, which I believe is true. For Schism is the Mother of Contention.

You find that the *Corinthians* were divided in their Opinions, about their Ministers, one cries *I am of Paul*, as more Edifying; another cries *I am of Apollus*, and another *I am of Cephas*; this you say, did not make a Schism; for say you, *Why might not each go where he might be most edified*; but you say the Schism was, in that they Sacrific'd *Christian Love and Charity*; and after you say a great deal to little purpose. For,

Its very plain, the *Corinthians* were accus'd of that you call Schism, *namely* for preferring, or admitting one Minister above another, though justification was the pretence, and not for breach of Communion, for with whichsoever they Communicated, it was one and the same Communion; *but* Saint *Paul* and Christ were not divided, nor were either of the other divided from Christ, their Communion was the same, though their Cures were several; so that there was no reason (as you impertinently say) to silence any of them, for in them there was no Schism, nor any blame. But say you, *the way of curing this Schism was not to silence Apollus and Cephas, that they might all be of Paul*, and here you make St. *Paul* some sort of *amen* for your former Scandalous Exposition, in saying, *that he desired Souls Salvation before his own Credit*.

How impertinently do you say, the way to Cure this Schism was not to silence Apollus, &c. As if to silence you, that your followers may come to Church, were as illegal as to have silenced them: Sir there is a vast difference between you, and they, who are Pastors and Ministers of Christ, they are the Stewards of the Mysteries of God, and the Ministers of Reconciliation, and are made so by Apostolical Power; of them our Blessed Saviour saith (St. *John* 10. v. 2.) thus, *He that eneth in by the door, is the Shepherd.*



ing their Judgments and Understanding; you say not one word of Union and Communion, which is most strictly enjoyned in every Sentence in the Exhortation; That there be no Divisions or Schisms, which by the other Sentences, the Apostle tells 'em how to prevent, (*viz.*) that you all speak the same things, that ye be perfectly joynd together in the same mind, and in the same judgment; now it's impossible for people that speak the same things, and are perfectly joynd together in the same mind, and in the same judgment, to have any Divisions or Schisms. That learned and pious Doctor in our Church, **Doctor Hammond, Familiar in Fathers and Councils**, hath this Paraphrase upon this Text: *That, therefore which I first exhort you to, and that with all earnestness as possible (as the prime addition of these gifts, and graces that are among you) is this, that ye all teach the same Doctrine, and notwithstanding Charity and Unity; that there be no divisions in the Churches, but that ye be compaſſed, and United as Members of the same Body, in the same belief and affection.* Is not this quite different from your Exposition? you take off the force and efficacy of the Apostle's Exhortation to Unity, purposely to excuse your Schism; is any thing more demonstrative in the World, than that your practice is quite contrary to this Exhortation; who have set up a Communion separate from the Church of God, establish'd in this Kingdom, both by Divine and Civil Sanction.

You are unlucky in your Exposition, very wide from the mark; and it can never fare otherwise with you, while you live in Schism; it being the Nature of Schism to hurry men into a thousand errors.

Again in the former Paragraph, *That ye all speak the same things, viz. in the Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity, for (say you) in little things it can never be made a duty to be of the same Opinion, since it is morally impossible.* I must here say again what I have said; that different Opinions in meer Notions and Speculations, or any differing Opinions that break nor Communion, are not here meant; for so men may differ and not be guilty of Schism: But if you mean by morally impossible, that it is impossible for Christians to be perfectly joynd together in the same mind, and in the same Judgment (as the Apostles exhort) so, as to maintain Unity, and prevent Schism in the Church; either the Apostles Exhortation is to no purpose and effect, or your insinuation very vain. You go on, that ye be perfectly joynd together with the same mind, and in the same judgment

judgment (which say you) must be understood of a serious Endeavour as to it, for otherwise a perfect conjunction must be reserved for a world of other everlasting perfection.

Sir, are you so self dignify'd (to use your own words) as to be a Teacher of Saints, and know not, that a perfect Conjunction in the Catholick Church, and Communion of Saints, is required of all those who are to come to the world of everlasting perfection?

Your 11, 12, and 13, pages, are filled with an Enquiry of the *Corinthians* misinterpretations; you say, that *Clement's Romanus*, in his famous *Epistle to the Corinthians*, *he* *calls* *Schisms* *contentions*, which I believe is true. For Schism is the Mother of Contention.

You find that the *Corinthians* were divided in their Opinions, about their Ministers, one cries *I am of Paul*, as more Edifying; another cries *I am of Apollos*, and another *I am of Cephas*; this you say, did not make Schism; for say you, *Why might not each go where he might be most edified*; but you say the Schism was, *in that they Sacrificed Christian Love and Charity*; and after you say a great deal to little purpose. For,

Its very plain, the *Corinthians* were accus'd of that you call Schism, are y for preferring, or admitting one Minister above another, though justification was the pretence, and not for breach of Communion, for with whichsoever they Communicated, it was one and the same Communion; for Saint Paul and Christ were not divided, nor were either of the other divided from Christ, their Communion was the same, though their Cures were several; so that there was no reason (as you impertinently say) to silence any of them, for in them there was no Schism, nor any blame. But say you, *the way of curing this Schism was not to silence Apollos and Cephas, that they might all be of Paul*, and here you make St. Paul some part of *amen* is for your former Scandalous Exposition, in saying, *that he referred Souls Salvation before his own Credit*.

How impertinently do you say, the way to Cure this Schism was not to silence Apollos, &c. As if to silence you, that your followers may come to Church, were as illegal as to have silenced them: Sir there is a vast difference between you, and they, who are Pastors and Ministers of Christ, they are the Stewards of the Mysteries of God, and the Ministers of Reconciliation, and are made so by Apostolical Power; of them our Blessed Saviour saith (St. John 10. v. 2.) thus, *He that entereth in by the door, is the Shepherd*. C

*Shepherd of the Sheep*; but such as you, who climb up some other way, our Saviour (in the L. v.) calls a Thief and a Robber:

Had *Apollon* and *Cephas* been as disorderly and Schismatical as you *Churchmen* are, *St. Paul* would in all probability have exercised his Apostolical Power, and have silenced them as the Cure; and it is more than probable, that the path of Schism which you maintain, would receive a Cure, were you, and all such the I. v. of *St. Paul* silenced and suppressed.

In your Recipe for the Cure of Schism, one Ingredient is; *That they should walk all the same way, though they trace different paths*, (your falacy and equivocation in this is very visible) for here is nothing like a different path; was it is all one way, and one path; they were all United in the same Communion: But you cunningly insinuate this, merely to delude the ignorant and undiscerning, by perverting them, that your Conventicle is the same way with the Church; only (as you call it) *a different path*: which is no other than Schismatical meeting. So your cure of Schism is to continue in Schism. You are a rare Spiritual Physician.

And then to bring up the rear, you have this rare Inference, viz. *It appears that narrow Spirituality (which is a very improper expression) which confines Religion and the Church, to our way and party what ever it is, to the condemning of others that differ from us in little things, is the bane of the Christian Church.* And to make this as true as the Gospel, you set down a Latin Proverb; *hinc ille lachrymæ.*

Sir, Religion is the bond of Unity; did you ever know Religion with our Bounds, and Rules for all of that Religion to be confined to, even to a Punctilio, and is it narrow Spirituality to oblige those Rules, and to be confin'd within the Bounds of Religion? is it a Schismatical Principle to make a true Judgement of Schism (which you call an *Arch-Rebellion* in Christ's Kingdom) and censure them who are Guilty of it?

Have not all the eyes of your Conventling Communion Rules given them (though of your own parties making) by which they are confin'd to yours and distinguishable from all other different Communions? If you or any other of the Presbyterian Communion come to *London*, or any other part of this Kingdom; do not you hold exactly the same way of Worship as you have here? (sure you cannot deny this) and is not this to confine your Sect to your own way and Communion? Why then do you reproach fully call this *narrow Spirituality* in others, and practice it your selves. You

You say, *condemning of others that differ in little things, is the great Schismaticating principle which hath been so much the bane of the Christian Church* : hinc illæ lacrymæ.

It must rather be the setting up of your Separate Communion, that hath been so much the bane of this Christian Church. I am sure it was the Puritanical Faction, who in their Conventicles blew up the Trumpet of **Sedition** and **Rebellion**, and overturned the Government of both **Church** and **State**; and through pretended Sanctity and Gospel Zeal, perpetrated the most hellish Actions that ever were since *Adam*. Then was Violence under the colour of Zeal; the Note and Badge of Sanctity, Com-Loyalty to a Prince of incomparable piety, and faithfulness to the most impure Christian Church, was damnd for malignancy; I am sure you are of the same Tribe; these were the men, by whom the Church was not only rent in Pieces, but for a time (which was as long as they were in Power) rooted out; here we may truly say *hinc ille lacrymæ*. Mr. H. I lived in the time when through **Blood** and **Rebellion**, your Party gave Laws and Rules to all; then, all that were of our Church were not Censured for little things, but Branded for Reprobates; Excluded from Mercy, all the Clergy, not only Silenced, but Sequestred, and many Imprisoned and starved; it was not much worse with Christians under *Nero* and *Dioclesian*, and all this for not Conforming to your Novel Discipline; yet the gentle Penalties of the Royal Laws, which were made for Peace and Unity, are cry'd up by you and your Party, for such a Persecution as never was. Alas Sir, for all your pretended Meekness and Charity now, you that retain the same principles, would certainly repeat the same miseries, had you the same power, *which God of his Infinite mercy for ever prevents*, Amen,

Now I return, and try whether from your Influence in the *Corinthians*, you could not have found a far more genuine conclusion, and more agreeing with the Apostles meaning.

If but the having one Minister of Christ, though rightly ordained in admiration above another, to the begetting Contention, incur the Guilt of Schism, and is no way to be Tollerated in the Church of God?

How much more am I a Schismatick, who am not only, not rightly ordained, but keep up a Communion separate from the Church of God,

in the Kingdom where I live, the Argument will hold a *Minor ad Majus*. If contentions about admitting one Minister above another, be Schism then sure to maintain a Separate Communion, which makes Contention much hotter, fiercer and more numerous, must much more be Schism.

In Page 15. you say, *That's Schism, which breaks or slackens the Bond by which the Members are knit together*. In this you are Orthodox, but you keep not to it; for you say,

*Now that bond is not an Act of Uniformity in point of Communion in the same Modes and Ceremonies, but true Love and Charity in point of Affection.*

The breach of Communion, be it for want of Uniformity in the same Modes and Ceremonies, or what you will, (that is not sinful) does certainly (to use your own words) *Break and Slacken the Bond by which the Members are knit together*; for to divide in point of Communion, is to dis-unite and unknit the Members; and consequently the Bond, be it (as you say) *Love and Charity*, or the Unity of the Spirit, or what you please, is broken; and this you most truly say is Schism; and yet you say, *that the Bond is not an Act of Uniformity, &c. in point of Communion*; which is a manifest contradiction.

Now all these erroneous and miserably mistaken Expositions of Scripture, and inferences equally false, are the Foundation upon which you erect your Description of Schism: and which at present you apprehend, is the true Scriptural Notion of Schism; which that all who read these papers may judge of, I here insert.

“ Schism is an Uncharitable Distance, Division, or Alienation of Affection, among those who are called Christians, and agree in the Fundamentals of Religion, occasioned by their different apprehensions about little things.

You agree with our Church in all that you call Fundamentals, and your Distance and Division you acknowledge, is for little things, that it is an Uncharitable Distance, and Division is undeniable; for the breach of Christian Communion, is certainly the breach of Christian Charity: here you are Condemned out of your own mouth.

But how far different your Description is from the Primitive Catholic Notion of Schism, sufficiently appears to you, by what I have shewed before.

You



**You mention not Separating,** or withdrawing from the Communion of the Church; which is most infamous and Notorious Schism, and confine it only to breach of Charity, which (though always a great fault) yet in many cases amounts not to Schism.

I now take notice of your Fourth Inference, page 23.

*If this be Schism, then there may be Separation of Communion, where there is no Schism, (say you) for thus we all agree, that there may be difference of apprehension, and yet no Schism, provided it do not cut out Christian Love; but be managed amicably, as betwixt the Arminians and the Calvinists in the Church of England.*

What strange kind of Reasoning is this?

If breach of Charity be Schism? then separate Communion may be without Schism; and to prove this, you instance in the difference between the *Arminians* and *Calvinists* in the Church of England, who differed in Opinions; the former Asserting the Freedom or Liberty of the Will, the other Election and Reprobation; here was no separation of the Communion, or denial of any Article of the Church; (for both sign'd the Articles) not from Communion one with another: both parties submitting to the Uniformity required; so you bring an instance to justify separate Communion from Schism, where there was no separate Communion at all; see how illogical your reasoning is?

*If breach of Charity be Schism, then there may be separate Communion without Schism.* Would any man of Sense, but you, have made such a Conclusion from such premises, would not the Argument have run truer thus?

*If breach of Charity be Schism, then separate Communion is much more Schism.* But breach of Charity is Schism.

Therefore, &c. I am forced here to say what I have said before, that it is most manifest, that a separate Communion, unless from a Schismatical Church, is in it self the aggravation and extremity of Schism, and is naturally and infallibly the cause of the highest breaches of Charity, and of the hottest and fiercest contentions, which you own to be Schism.

But suppose there were something in our Constitutions that needed amendment or alteration, yet every defect and supposed Corruption in a Church, is not a sufficient ground for Separation or warrant enough to tear it in pieces. Hear Mr. *Calvins* Opinion, he saith, where ever the Word of God is duely Preached, and Reverently

ly attended to, and the true use of the Sacraments kept up; there is an appearance of a true Church, whose Authority no man may dispise, or reject its admonitions, or resist its Councils; or set at nought its Discipline, much less separate from it, and Violate its Unity so long as it continues in the true use of the Word and Sacraments, though otherwise it be over-run with many blemishes and corruptions. *Inss. l. 4. Sect. 10, 11; & 12.* You see how Mr. *Calvin* is against you, from whom the Original of your way had its date.

I here make it my hearty request to you, that you will read the Letters of the Reformed Divines of Foreign Countries, to the Bishop of *London*, viz.

That, of Monsieur *le Moine*, Professor of Divinity at *Leyden*, concerning the Nature of our Differences, and the unlawfulness of Separation from the Church of **England**,

That, of Monsieur *de Langle*, a Preacher of the Reformed Church-meetings, at *Charenton near Paris*. And also,

That of Monsieur *Claude*, all of the same Subject; you have them all at the end of Dr. *Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness of Separation*. They all conclude you under *Schlim*.

In Page the 20th. towards the end, you have these words, (I need not mention the occasion having dispatched that before) *Whether they be Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independent, or by what Name or Title soever they be self-dignified or distinguished*; you cannot forbear not only Uncharitable-ness, but Hatred and Malice against the Clergy; and consequently the whole Church, you Condemn Bitterness, and Uncharitableness, as *Schlim* in all other; and where can it be found more apparently than in you, in these words? *By what Name or Title soever they be self-dignified or distinguished*; these are not Applicable to your Party, lets to the Anabaptists; then they must be spoken of the Arch-Bishops and Bishops of our Church, whom the King always nominates, and they are accordingly truly Consecrated to be so; Orders instituted by the Apostles in the Church of Christ, and from them continued to this present age, without interruption 1 *Cor. 12, 28.* And God hath set some in the Church; first Apostles, secondarily Prophets; thirdly Teachers, &c. helps in Government, &c. God hath set them up, and you revile them, as men setting up, and dignifying themselves, in this your Charity; what more Diabolical Spirit can there be in any Sect

among men, than thus to dispise and set at nought, those who are dignified by Divine Right and Authority, to Rule and Govern in the Church of God: you make it a Schismaticating Principle to censure you of Uncharitableness, and Bitterness, who have even in this, rank'd your self among those whom the Apostle *St. Jude* (in his Epistle verse 28.) calls *silly Dreamers, who speak evil of Dignities*. Yet say you.

*But to come a little closer, the Meetings of the Dissenters (though now blessed by God permitted, and allowed by the Law of the Land, yet are commonly charged with being Schismatical; the great Out-cry is, that we leave the Church; and the Unthanking Moblie, who are so well taught, as to know no other Churches, but the Publick places of Worship, are easily induced to believe it; as if at were Schism, to Worship God any where else, let the Worship there be what it will, (you go on) those who will allow themselves the Liberty of an Unprejudiced thought, cannot but see the difference so small, that as long as we believe the same Christian Faith, and agree in the same Protestant abhorrence of Papal Delusions; we may easily be looked upon, as one and the same Church, as well as two several Parish Churches may, especially being United under the Care and Protection of one Protestant King, and Members of the same Protestant Common-Wealth.*

Sir, Indulgence (which carries the Title of the Act) always employs a defect, if not a Crime; you say, you are permitted and allowed, though the Act is no more than Indulgence, which never signifies approbation or liking; all you have by it is, but for the hardness of your Hearts; as our Blessed Saviour says, of the Indulgence of the *Jews*, for putting away their Wives by a Bill of Divorce; to which our Saviour saith *Mat. 19. 8. But in the beginning it was not so*. Their Plea for that Indulgence is destroyed by an Argument drawn from Antiquity. I have the like Argument for you; in the Primitive Church it was not so, no Indulgence for separate Communion, upon any pretence whatsoever; you have one, and I give my reason why I wish no ill effects follow it.

In the year 1560. Mr. *J. Calvin* by his Letter to Arch Bishop *Grindal*, solicits him to obtain the favour of the Queen, to Assign; and at his request, she did Assign the Church of Saint *Anthony* in *London*, for some *French* exiles then there, and were of Mr. *Calvin*s Principle, to meet in, and with License to set up the *Genevean* Discipline, and a Form of Prayer which had no Conformity with the *English* Liurgy, which proved

in the event a design expedient of *Calvins*, for advancing Presbitery in the room of Episcopacy.

Upon this *Toleration*, their numbers so increased, that in the year 1568. they broke out into open Schism, choosing to meet in *Barns and fields*, rather than in *Churches*, with their Brethren as formerly; teaching 'twas impious to hold any Correspondence with the Conforming Churches. Upon this very occasion (*viz.*) the Queens Toleration, and particularly her Indulging the *Genevian* Discipline, within 8 years time, their Members so increased, and their Insolence also; that the Queen plainly saw (as her own words were) that such were the restless Spirits of that Factious people, that here was no quietness to be expected from them, till they were utterly suppressed: In order to which she called a Parliament in 1592. wherein strict Laws were made against them, and executed accordingly; *Barrow, Penny*, and *Burket*, were hanged for such Nonconformity-principles as were Treasonable; and by those sharp Laws made against them, the Ring leaders were humbled, and the whole Body of 'em brought to a good degree of Quietness at that time and held during her Reign.

I heartily wish that your Great Champion Mr. *Baxter*, prove not a true Prophet, who in his *Epistle Dedicatory*, (before his *Treatise of Self-denial*) to Coll. *James Barrey*, then one of the Council of State; calls *Toleration* Englands misery; a *Liberty for drawing men to Hell*; a *wicked damning Liberty*; a *Sirengthening the Party Tolerated*; a *growing way for their Power*; a *giving a way our own Power*; a *preparing Faggots for our own Marindom*. And he represents Tolerating Magistrates, as a sort of men that Rule as though they were uncertain whether there were a Heaven or a Hell. Thus he,

By the story in the Queen, you see what use your Predecessors, those great pretenders of Sanctity, made of their Indulgence; and if you tread their Paths, you may fall into the like mischicks; and I will tell you why you can never stand right with the Government; because your Principles carry you to the rooting out of Episcopacy, which is the Pillar of Ecclesiastical Government. And we see by Mr. *Baxter*, with what Vigor and Zeal Uniformity will then be held forth in all your Pulpits.

I now return to the remainder of your Paragraph. You say, *the meeting of the Dissenters* (and after a Parenthesis) *are commonly charged with being Schismatical; the great outcry is, that we leave the Church, and the unthinking Mobile, who are so well taught as to know no other Churches, but the publick places of Worship, are easily induced to believe it, as if it were schism to Worship God any where else, let the Worship there be what it will.*

You cannot be without the Leaven of Reflection, for all your pretending Candor and Charity, is not this highly reproachful: to say that the Unthinking Mobile, &c. are easily induced to believe it, (that is) that your Meeting is Schism; What can you mean but the Pastors and Ministers of our Church, seduce the Mobile to believe that which is false, and the unthinking Mobile are easily induced? This is a pretty falacy, by this you would persuade all (if you could) that none but the Mobile believe you are Schismatics; all the Privy Council, the Judges, Universities, and Magistrates, and all above the Mobile have no such thoughts; this is a random Shot: Pray how many besides the unthinking Mobile can you boast of in your Communion? God knows you have too much to boast of, if you have any; however your boasting in this, is much more vain, than God be thanked you have real cause for; and all those Poor Souls you have Captivated, and lead astray out of Christs Fould, are ignorant, or Giddy-minded; and it is done under pretence of more Spiritual Edification and Holiness, which is but the Counterfeit of them which elitters with greater Lustre (it being the Nature of all Counterfeit things so to do) to the Underscarning and Ignorant, than the real: just as Quack Mountebanks, with cunning devised Words, and Fables, persuade the Mobile, that their Medicines have much more the Virtue of Healing, and that their skill and judgement far surmounts the truly Learned and Judicious Physicians: But God I hope will consider their simplicity, and have mercy on them; though I wish they would consider what our Saviour saith, *That if the Blind lead the Blind, both shall into the Ditch.* Then you say, *as fit were Schism to Worship God any where else, let the Worship there be what it will.*

D

It



It would occasion too long a discourse to pursue; I will therefore only mention it. The *Samaritans* in the time of our Saviour were as fully persuaded, that their Altar and Worship was as true and acceptable to God as that at *Jerusalem*; as you are, that yours is more pure than that of our Church; yet our Blessed Saviour tells the Woman, *St. John 4* that *ye worship ye know not what, me (saith he) know what me I worship, &c.* The true reason why the *Samaritans* worshiped they knew not what; was, because it was a separate Altar, and a separate Worship from that at *Jerusalem*; this was Schism, and had the same effects, as your separate Communion-bath in this Kingdom, (*viz.*) Contention, breach of Charity, alienation of Affection, &c.

And I do not see, but as it was Schism in the *Jewish*, which was the Type of the Christian Church, to set up a separate Altar, and Worship, so it must be Schism, to set up a separate Table, and separate way of Worship in the Christian Church, which is the Anti-type.

I mention this, because you, in the 32 page say, *The common Out-cry is, that it is the setting up Altar against Altar*; supposing your thoughts here, might be upon Mr *Dedwells* one Altar, and one Priesthood, as that which makes the Out-cry against you; though the Term of *Setting up Altar against Altar*, was used by many of the Fathers in the Primitive Times, against Schismatics in their days, whom he follows. But Sir, If you without prejudice, will seriously peruse that Book, you will find such weighty reasoning, that you will never more despise it; and if you cannot but despise it, you will perpetuate your Name amongst the most Learned and judicious, above all your Tribe that have been, or are, and profane the Diocese besides; if you will Answer that Book. However it will be a sufficient Answer, for me to say, it is not the place that makes the Schism, but the separate Communion; for, if you use your way of Worship in one of our Churches; it would not abate or excuse the Schism; and so, if you were rightly ordained, and should use the same way of Worship which we use in our Churches, and is required by the Church in your ~~Table~~, and through some Providence necessitated to such a place; no one of our Church would, nor any other justly could charge you with Schism.

In your 25 page, *Those who will allow themselves the Liberty of an Unprejudiced thought, cannot but see the difference so small, that as long as we believe the same Christian Faith, and agree in the same Protestant abhorrence of Papal delusions; we may easily be looked upon as one and the same, as well as two several Parish Churches may, especially being United under the care and protection of one Protestant King, and Members of the same Commonwealth.*

Difference in small and little things comes oft in my way; I cannot but wonder, that we who agree in the Beliet of those High and Sacred Mysteries of Faith, so contrary to Flesh and Blood, and so transcendent above Natural reason, which cannot be wrought in us, but by the Grace of God, and the operation of his Spirit; and yet that even among these, there should be men of high and preverse minds, sensual, and such who cause Division: As the *Donatists*, who did separate and rend the Church, and yet believed the same Fundamental Faith, and were Zealous (to use your own Words) for the great Gospel Truths, but their separation was as yours is, for little things. How would you have your Separate Communion to be looked upon as one and the same Church, as well as two several Parish Churches? When it is apparent that you do Rob our Parish Churches. All you can and would Monopolize all our Parishes into your Communion, and yet forsooth would be looked upon as one of our Parish Churches: This is a Paradox which pass is all understanding.

And it is as wonderful, that the having the same Protestant abhorrence of Popish delusions, should be a bar to Schism; a man may be an Arian, Socinian; ay, or an Atheist, if he can but abhor Popery, and yet be free from Schism; is this one of your great Gospel Truths? Is this any thing like Primitive Doctrine? that Heresy, Atheism, Quakerism, and all other divided and corrupt Opinions, so they but abhor Popery, may be looked upon as one and the same Church; is new and strange Divinity.

Sir, all that follows in your Book, being of the same spinning I will spare my self from any more trouble, and expose you no farther. The Reader will be able to Judge, whether I have, or not, given you a truer Notion of Schism,  
D<sup>2</sup>

Schism than that in your Enquiry, and sufficiently convicted your unskilfulness in expounding Scripture; and fully Answered you.

I will only add this digression, which I think not impertinent, and then I'll close.

The Prayers made for the *Wednesday* Fast, cannot be Charged with Popery, as your Party have the Liturgy; Supplications fitted to the Occasion, and for all capacities, impoſed by Lawful Authority, by them who have the Rule over us; What account can you give to God, to the Government, and to your own Conſcience, why you omit or refuse ſo indiſpenſible a duty.

The Apoſtle ſaith, *Obey them that have the Rule over you; and Command this duty of Obedience to our Governors, upon the Severest and Higheſt Penalties. Rom. 13. v. 1, 2. Whoſoever therefore reſiſteth the Power, reſiſteth the Ordinance of God; and they that reſiſt ſhall receive to themſelves damnation.*

How can you reconcile your Practice with this Apoſtolical Injunction? Unleſs you can charge the Prayers with ſomething not lawful, or not reaſonable to be offered to God; you are highly Criminal in the Apoſtles Judgment. God Almighty hath now ſettled the Government, where there is as true and real Abhorrence of Popiſh Deluſions, as you or any of your Party can pretend to; yet you yield not obedience to them even in a Religious Duty.

All your pretence is, that your Prayers are more purely Spiritual; you ſeek God in more apt and pleaſing words, words which immediately flow from the Spirit.

What is this? but to limit and refrain the Holy Scripture to your way and to your Faction, as if no Prayers but thoſe hammered out of your own Brains, could bear the ſtamp of the Holy Spirit of God; and is it \* not highly Prophane, if not Blaſphemous, to impure all your Levities and Impertinencies to the immediate dictates of the Spirit of God? though this Holy Spirit you pretend to, can no where be found, but in the Holy Catholick Church, and Communion of Saints; where alone our Bleſſed Lord hath Promiſed it ſhall be to the end of the World.

All

\* *Swearing in Robbery.*

All the Impostors in the world who have set up before you even *Metanasthet* himself, and a great number of Hereticks, and Schismatics in the Christian Church, pretended to inspiration; and by it have deceived many. But this your pretence to inspiration, can never profelyte any, but the Ignorant and Underscriving, and those who are given to Change; unless you can produce the Credentials of a Miracle.

All our Prayers in our Liturgy are directed to God Almighty, and are presented in the name of the Blessed Jesus, and all we supplicate for, are for no other things, but what is allowed of, and required in our holy Religion: Now why any but Atheists, and those that are Antichristian, joyn not with us in those Prayers and Praises, especially considering that it is the Apostle Saint Paul's Judgment, *Rom. 15. 6. That we might with one mind, and with one Mouth glorifie God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*; I know not, unless for the same Reason that you refuse those Prayers for the Fast added to the Liturgy, viz. Obstinate and Disobedience.

Now Sir, to close up all; you cannot but see your Guilt, I Address to you in all Meekness and Christian Charity, that you will seriously consider the dangerous and desperate State and Condition you are in; for all the great and precious promises, made by God in Christ Jesus, are only to them who are Members of the Mystical Body of Christ, the Holy Catholick Church and Communion of Saints, they who are not of the Catholick Church, and Communion of Saints, may flatter themselves with Unwarrantable and Groundless Fancies; but can have no real Title, or Right to any of those precious Promises; and therefore as you love your Soul, suffer not filthy Lucre, Interest or Pride to withhold you any longer out of the Catholick Church wherein alone Salvation can be had, it is not your purer Administrations, or any other pretence, can avail or stand you in any stead, they only who are of this Society, which is the Mystical Body of Christ here on-earth; have any Right (*Heb. 12. vers. 22. 23. 24.*) to come to the Mount *Sion*, and unto the City of the living God, the Heavenly *Jerusalem*, and to an innumerable Company of Angels

Angels to the General Assembly, and Church of the first born, which are Written in Heaven: And to God the Judge of all; and to the Spirits of just men made perfect: And to Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant; that you may have Right and Title to all this; I heartily Pray with the Church in the Liturgy, *That it may please God to bring you into the way of Truth; and all such as have erred, and are deceiverd, Amen.*



FINIS

---



which  
to the  
of the  
s; h  
pleas  
d are